

## Foster Parent 1624 Statewide Consultation Team

### Draft Meeting Minutes – 04/23/12

Participating: Denise Revels Robinson, Becky Smith, Myra Casey, John March, Bernice Morehead, Meri Waterhouse, Leah Stadjuhar, Marjorie Fitzgerald-Rinehart, Tammy Cordova, Michelle Bogart, Karen Dinan, Theresa Tanoury, Beth & Mike Canfield, Amy Gardner, Sara Blanchette, Elizabeth Griffin Hall, Josh Hinman, Tess Thomas, Talya Miller, Debra Ellsworth, Shala Crow, Gina Coats, Victoria Erwin, Ginger Schutt, Cindy Gardner, Kristin Otoupalik, Marty Butkovich, Nancy Sutton, Joel Odimba, Laurie Palmquist, Kathy Ramsay, Stephanie Allison-Noone, Dru Powers, Lyn Okarski

AGENDA TOPIC	TEAM DECISION (including vote record)	ASSIGNMENTS (lead &/or workgroup members/due date)	REPORT TO TEAM (if needed – date assigned)	COMPLETED DATE
Workgroups Report Out	<p>Myra Reporting: workgroup met – many topics – standards, licensing written per WAC/law which makes it appears FPs are held to higher standard Solutions: Workgroup members bring situations to review, how are investigations handled; are they processed same way, results and accountability,</p> <p>FPs and Swkrs should discuss any issues during 30 day visits and how they can be addressed. Address issues whenever possible early on. Assignment complete</p> <p>Denise suggested–sampling foster parents who have been subject of investigations with established questions asked consistently. Develop a way to follow up over time. Unrelated to investigation/allegations (phone call). Group to come up with questions utilized.</p> <p>Meri Reporting: Foster Parent Grief &amp; Loss – Caregiver Connection article published, list of providers is under development, process for paying for service through FamLink is challenging and will require development of new codes.</p>	<p>Myra lead - develop sampling of foster parents subject of investigations with consistently asked questions. Her group will come up with questions utilized.</p> <p>Meri lead – develop list of Grief &amp; Loss providers, Need for FamLink payment codes reviewed and developed with Fiscal</p>	<p>July 2012</p> <p>July 2012</p>	Caregiver Article published April 2012

General Medical Care & Treatment	See section below - Michelle and Karen reviewed both Medical and Immunization issues.	See below	See below	
Immunization & Medical care	<p>Michelle Bogart and Karen Dinan, AAG (see handout provided) Immunizations – is there a scenario bringing concern? (lack of clarity, nothing in writing, different providers allow, or don't allow foster parents to sign for acknowledgement that the immunization given. When child presents with no immunizations and Dr. wants to catch the child up...with no authorization from parents or social worker).</p> <p>Karen D referenced Steve Hassett's (retired AAG) legal opinion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CA pick up order includes provision for agency to provide routine medical care and CA delegates authority to caregivers thru WAC 388</li> <li>• CA Policy 4517 references EPSDT exam which includes immunizations. Liability ?: DSHS can't prevent parent from filing lawsuit, when staff and FPs follow policy and med. advice, liability is very low. Signing by fps. for the acknowledgement of the service given is okay. Michelle / Karen can update the Hassett memo, which is still valid.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Michelle / Karen update Hassett memo, for clarification and distribution to foster parents.</li> <li>• Michelle/Karen: develop update for C. Connection</li> <li>• Meri: include update in C. Connection &amp; post on FP web site.</li> <li>• Michelle: Pediatric consultants receive copy of update.</li> </ul>	<p>July 2012</p> <p>July 2012</p> <p>August 2012</p> <p>August 2012</p>	

Respect	<p>Relates to discussion by Myra's work group. When FPs feel they aren't being heard. Internal staffing occurs, results considered on investigation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FPs should understand allegations and outcomes. Licensor should refer to WAC and inform FP of appeal process. Meeting with FP prior to decision not happening.</li> <li>• FPs meet with DLR prior to internal meeting, communication doesn't happen with FP, until they're told of investigation. (i.e.: 2nd call, allegations in writing, meeting with caregiver before letter goes up chain of command – group with Jeanne reviewed this.) Process change needs to be embedded in process.</li> <li>• Early problem solving should occur with FPs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Myra: follow up with Jeanne on issue.</li> </ul>		
Respite Care	<p>Meri: Respite Care problems with inconsistent payments. Much of this is due to large number of SSPS codes used to process rate payments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Richard Tagorda –DLR Seattle, and other CA staff will send Respite packets into Meri.</li> </ul> <p>Provide clarification on payment for respite care</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meri: post SSPS codes table on FP web page for reference on respite rates</li> </ul>	July 2012	
Liaison Training	<p>Shala: Liaisons need more information of new processes to better share info and provide improved support to FPs. New contractor under the Foster Care Recruitment &amp; Retention RFP will provide clear information to liaisons under new contract.</p>	Info only		

Emails	<p>Debra: Liaisons get names &amp; contact info of interested potential FPs through State Recruitment Information Center (SRIC) by e-mails, to offer support and track and help through licensing process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reg. 1: On last night of PRIDE RFTI offers Release to FPs to obtain names; info submitted to DLR and once licensed FPs names are shared. CPAs do own PRIDE; names not shared w/ DLR from their classes. How to better support these families, when they can't identify who they are. Release on application allows for agency to share name/contact info. Licensor can share once authorization is given. CPA coalition meetings – Becky and Josh can discuss issue. For CAs FPs, continue process identifying authorizations at licensure.</li> </ul>	<p>Becky and Josh to discuss at CPA Coalition Meeting.</p> <p>DLR to review internally on consistent process.</p>	<p>July</p> <p>July</p>	
Protocol Discussion Youth 18+	<p>Stephanie/Leah/Tess: When youth 18+ run from placement Should FPs file run report on these young adults? LE isn't filing report. Clarification of process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extended Foster Care Program-2011 allows youth to voluntarily remain in FC by extending dependency beyond 18.</li> <li>H&amp;S visits continue, sib visits continue, policies continue to pertain to them, including Missing From Care.</li> <li>Youth 18+ in extended FC continue to be defined as "child" for purpose of this program.</li> <li>Law Enf. views them as adults and won't file a runaway report. If the youth runs, notify social worker, not law enforcement.</li> <li>Hold the bed? When youth runs the CA. will ask court to dismiss dependency. CA is required to keep placement open until court dismisses dependency. CA is now developing WAC on this area.</li> <li>These youth are adults and staff need to be working with youth as they develop planning for independent living.</li> <li>The legislature extended FC to allow youth to attend</li> </ul>	Info only		

	<p>college/technical college and finish programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Also 6 month trial independence program allows youth to leave dependency and experience life. Youth must be enrolled in High School or advanced educational program. Youth can return to dependent care within 6 months but no services are provided during the 6 month youth is out of FC. Youth are not allowed to come and go several times. After youth's 18<sup>th</sup> birthday many who exit care return to CA and into dependency to move forward. Once Court closes a youth's dependency, after a trial independence, the case is closed and can't be reopened. Any further change would need to be legislative (not policy).</li> </ul>			
Special Topics Training and Parenting Plus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FPs living in outlying communities experience difficulty in obtaining special topics training when classes held during work day making it difficult for FPs to attend.</li> <li>Parenting Plus can be taken by section rather than consecutively rather than taking the full session to help with child care and minimize expenses families incur.</li> <li>Suggestion: Parenting Plus should be marketed on a strengths based focus to increase positive skill building not just as a mandatory class. The mandatory 36 hours of post licensure training during 1<sup>st</sup> year, is now is 39 hours of training and it asks too much of foster parents – maybe extend completion time frame to 18 months?</li> <li>Concern: Time availability offered and must be registered by end of first year of licensure (18 months).</li> <li>Training process helps build continuity and strength between foster parents in scheduling through participation. Partnership with UW will help increase partnership and capacity for expansion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Original Committee will reconvene to discuss.</li> <li>Marjorie will call committee back.</li> <li>Committee open to any 1624 Rep to join.</li> <li>Marjorie reviewing regional availability.</li> </ul>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Special topics also during day and are not available weekends or evenings.</li> </ul>			
Concurrent Planning /Permanent Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reg. 3 North and FPAWS/ Leah and Becky: Concerns: FPs are being asked to adopt in advance of child's plan for permanency (within first week of placement). See April's agenda topic for issue. Concurrent planning is currently viewed as pushing permanency too fast. Foster parents should not feel guilty if they don't want to adopt. Method of how the discussion is being brought up.</li> <li>• Unified HS will address what all caregiver's commitment to permanency is and issue of social worker's conversation on concurrent planning. Education/training needed on social worker's timing for these conversations. (not in first 7 days). Safety Framework will also support.</li> <li>• Becky is open to suggestions on supporting this need/training. With level of staff turnover, continuous training to staff on this issue needs to exist</li> <li>• What gaps exist that could be addressed as part of the assessment with UW? Add to post academy training. Add permanency planning training for foster parents. FP associations and private agencies do training. Is there a consistent power point that could be used? Work on training planning.</li> </ul>	Leah lead, CA will work on the education/training development and will lay out next steps.		
Travel Policy	<p>Nancy: Impacts to foster parents CA needs to know where children are. Develop understanding of issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is not a new policy and has been in place, but not fully communicated and understood.</li> <li>• FPs need more information to understand what appears to be travel restrictions especially for families on state borders and if short notice travel opportunity comes up</li> </ul>	Nancy S: will research/develop briefing paper and present to team.		

FP Survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New Survey now in process through Research &amp; Development. Shorter survey please encourage FPs to participate.</li> </ul>	Info only		
Teresa Tanoury: UW partnership on child welfare	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Goal is to increase infrastructure, and capacity to provide training for child welfare staff, foster and adoptive parents. Funding development (IV-E enhancement)</li> <li>Packet material available. CA's Training and RFTI staff are now with the UW.</li> <li>Competency based, accessible, continuum of learning, sharing of resources, statewide standing committees beginning next month, regional groups include FPs who are already participating (Reg. 1 North), formal way to evaluate and assess quality, Need of CA for more capacity.</li> </ul>	Info only		
Rate Assessment (RA)	<p>Nancy: Focused on children with high level needs. Rate reduced to level 1 when the high level need child moves to another home. Rate is re-evaluated in the new home but sometimes is delayed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What happens on RA during summer when a child is home for longer periods of time? (in comparison to school when child is away from home for longer periods)</li> <li>Review history of RA process development. RA model developed by Actuaries. Issues identified / incentives / disincentives. Adjustments would be major undertaking with a comprehensive review needed.</li> <li>Connection between child's needs/behaviors and FPs care/skill/time in meeting needs. Different placement settings may offer different services and children may respond differently in different homes. Rate Assessors: do RA in first week. Children honeymoon and may not clearly reflect hours FP is actually spending. RA is recommended in 3<sup>rd</sup> week with FP, to identify a child's typical &amp;/ongoing behaviors above a</li> </ul>	Becky says another discussion needs to be held prior to any movement/decisions		

	<p>normally developing child.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Payment drops to Level 1 which ensures basic rate is initially paid to FP.</li> <li>• If rate followed child, assessment would ensue more quickly? Situations can occur where FPs could be responsible for an overpayment if child is assessed at a lower rate.</li> <li>• RA identifies needs of child and how child's needs are met (maybe through multiple resources available to FP through community or CPA).</li> </ul>			
Respect	<p>Beth: Clarity on differing roles of foster parents and CA staff. <b>Issue Tabled.</b> This may not need to go forward.</p>	Beth will send letter prior to next meeting.		
Legislation 2264 – Tammy Cordova	<p>Tammy Cordova: New legislation established and gives clear mandate on requirements of Performance Based Contracting. Amended timelines of 2106 and moved them out 3 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Family Support Services – CA is required to consult with community groups for advice on what those categories of family support services should be. CA is reaching out to FPs on this issue. Think about: What services do bio/birth families need? Concrete supports, services to safely keep their children in their own home and prevent placement, and to facilitate a successful reunification with their children?</li> <li>• Online survey will be available – link will be sent out to access.</li> <li>• Contact Tammy Cordova with any questions</li> </ul>	Tammy will provide info on survey and link to Meri to send out.		Completed May 2012
Other Info	<p>Meri:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2011 FP Survey Satisfaction Rate: 79.2%. This shows consistent growth in FPs reporting they are receiving better information and support from the agency. An increase of more than 3% over last year.</li> </ul>			



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2012 FP Survey coming soon. Please share info and take survey.</li> <li>• New CA FP website Forms File is now posted to help FPs access frequently used forms.</li> <li>• We Are Family Day w/ Mariners May 6<sup>th</sup> – See you at the ball park!</li> <li>• Camp to Belong – applications are out</li> <li>• Whooping Cough Alert/Immunizations</li> <li>• New federal Youth Credit Check law and CA policy</li> </ul>			
--	---	--	--	--

Debriefing Conference Call: May 21, 2012 9-10:00 a.m.

Agenda Building Conference Call: June 18, 2012 9-10:00 a.m. Call in Number: 1-605-477-3000, Participant Code: 186895#

Next Video Conference Meeting: July 23, 1-4:00 p.m. at Regional Video Conference Sites